

A Muzzle for a Mad Dog: 12

O R,

ANIMADVERSIONS

On some late

Scandalous Papers

CALL'D

REHEARERS,

TREATING

About the SOUL, but wrote without SPIRIT, or LIFE,
in Defiance to the Truth of Reveal'd Religion.

CONTAINING

The most Material Arguments in that Controversie,
about the Nature of the SOUL, Debated, and Undi-
cated, from false and Groundless Aspersions.

By EVAN LLOYD, of Clontanhuyd, Gent. K.

*It is better to hear the Rebuke of the Wise, than for a Man
to hear the Song of Fools. For as the Crackling of Thorns
under a Pot, so is the Laughter of the Fool, Eccles. vii. 5, 6.*

L O N D O N,

Printed, and Sold by Ben. Bragge in Paternoster-Row, 1707.

R

L

g
d
W
y
o
p
k
f
y
w
D
m

To the Reverend

Mr. JAMES LESLE,

Reputed Author of Publick Papers, call'd
the REHEARSERS, Wrote in May and
June, 1707.

S I R,

I Love not to accost a Gentleman, without giving him the right Title by which he is *Dignify'd*, and desires to be *Distinguish'd*; Therefore, Reverend Author of a Publick Paper, let You and I reason together, why you cannot write against an Opinion you don't approve, but (*to mingle much Malice with a little Wit*) you must represent Persons by their Names, in your Publick Papers, as you have done Dr. Coward, as one of *Irreligious, Unchristian, if not Atheistical* Principles, by *Overthrowing the Doctrine of the Resurrection, making God to be Matter, &c.* without any Grounds of Reason, or Colour of sound Argumentation. Nay, this you do too by so light and trivial Arguments, manag'd with such weak Deductions, or false Application of the Doctor's Meaning, or wresting his Expressions to abominable wrong Interpretation, that scarce any Man

that bears the Character of a *Reputed Scholar*, except your self, screen'd under the Clownish Garb of a Country-man's Education, and Language, would have the Confidence to own. And in Truth, your Manner, and Style of writing, concerning a Gentleman of his Character, Learning and Worth, gives you a just Claim to the Title of a Rustick Education: And 'tis pity you had not been bred a Country-man indeed, seeing you treat Gentlemen in so Rustick a Way, and then perhaps you might have supply'd the Defect of some Able-Body'd Land-Man, or Seaman, *contrary to your own Inclination for the Service of your Country*. You say indeed, (Rehears. June, *That it is rude to publish Persons Name, who are not willing to be known*) yet you could do this bare-fac'd to Dr. Coward, who would not have his Name affix'd to the *Treatise of Second Thoughts*, &c. Because knowing that an *Irrefragable and Unconfutable Truth*, obtruded as it were by force, on the Learned Part of the World, would make him, as it did St. Paul, become *their Enemy because he told them Truth*. Now, what could you propose by reviving this Controversie, to serve either the Church, or State, or Religion in general? Or else you must do it out of a pure Principle of Malice, and Rancour, (*Two inseparable Ingredients of a discontented Non-Juror*) to ruin his Credit, Fortune and Reputation. For, as to your pretended Service to the Church, or State by it, I have some Reasons to believe, that as Both are now happily settled, *You would not serve either, if it were in your Power*: And for the Service and Benefit of Religion, you should have follow'd the Gospel Rule, *Sat down first, and have consider'd, whether you were able with Ten Thousand, to encounter an Adversary with Twenty Thousand*; that is, with all your Arguments and Learning,

to confute a Gentleman, that seems by his Writings, every way Superiour to you in both. You know a Confutation of that Opinion has already been unsuccessfully attempted by many, and some of no inferiour Character for Parts in the World, yet you see it was all *but Vanity and Vexation of Spirit*; their Augmentation generally ended in darting only, in the Language of the Prophet *David, Spears and Arrows, even bitter Words*: But were never able, by all the greatest Industry, and indefatigable Study, to make *Breath of Life*, which God gave to Man, *Gen. 2. 7.* at his first Creation, to signifie *Immaterial, or Spiritual Substance* united to Body. Now, did you think your self better able than Dr. *Nichols*, or Mr. *Broughton*, &c. Men of undoubted Characters, to have made Good the Interpretation of *Breath of Life*, to signifie *Spiritual Substance*? Sure no: Nay, do you think it convenient, (or rather I should put that to the Governours of the Church) that so serious a Matter relating to Religion should be bandy'd about in a Company of Common Paultry News Papers? No, if you had done any thing, you should have sent to the Doctor, to have desir'd a Friendly Conference with him, and that you had something more to offer, in order to a Confutation, than what had already been offer'd on that Subject, &c. And I don't doubt but that he would have comply'd with your Overtures, if you could have kept your Temper, and transacted Matters fairly, and Moderately, *as He does*, without Heats, and Animosities, to aggrandize a Party, in order to a National Ruin. If you had come so indeed, (though perhaps you could not conceal your natural Temper, but it would have discover'd a Serpent, if once Passion grew warm,) then I must tell you, the best way of Argumentation was by your Publick Papers, tho'

it

it looks not like a Scholar, or Politician, or indeed Congruous to the Design you would manage; to make a *Countryman* talk of *Personality*, and *Quid Humanum* (vid. *Rehears. May 10th.*) and indeed of most Points in Divinity. If you will make him a Theological Disputant, make him speak suitable to his Name, and Character; that is, ask *silly Questions*, and you answer them *wisely*, if you can; but not to dispute things above a Clownish Understanding. Symmetry, you know, in all things is commendable, and the Effect of a wise discerning Head, or the Product of a good Hand to bring Work into Order and Beauty, but where things are wrote with Incoherencies, and improper Characters, 'tis but a kind of *Patch-work of Learning* which may look pleasant to the Eye, but never makes any real Impression to captivate the Understanding of any but Children, and such like, who are easily deluded with Gewgaws, or fine Trappings of Argumentation. This the World calls *Amusing* and *Bantring* Mankind; now, if you think fit in handling such a serious Subject to do so, as you seem to have done in your late Publick Papers, the Doctor was in the right to be silent, and despise you with Ignominy and Contempt. But because I have a great respect for the Doctor, and his Opinion seems not in the least to reflect on Religion, or lessen the Force of it, but rather strengthens and confirms that grand Fundamental Point of the Christian Religion, relating to a *General Judgment*; and because your false and scandalous Representations of him, as to his Opinion, may prejudice his Interest in the World, I thought fit, out of a Christian Temper, as well as of a Friend, to gird on my *Armour* also against that *threatning Stroke*, mentiond *Rehears. May*; and defend him in his Opinion and Reputation. There-
fore

fore, that no Popular Clamour may from henceforth be unjustly, and upon no reasonable Grounds rais'd against the Doctor, if possible, I desire the Reader seriously to weigh the Arguments, by which he establishes and defends his Opinion, together with those of this Worthy and Reverend Writer of a publick Newspaper, and then tell me, if possible, wherein lies the *Prophaneness, Irreligion, or Atheism*. This I have form'd into a Dialogue, between my self and *Master Rehearser*; and don't pretend to add any but what are to be found in the Doctor's Writings on that Subject. But if any Man has a Mind to see his Vindication, done by himself, (better perhaps than I can do it) let him read his small Treatise, call'd the *Just Scrutiny*, &c. (Sold by T. Atkinson, at the *White Swan* in St. Paul's Church-yard,) and I doubt not but that he will be thoroughly satisfy'd, except where Prejudice of Education, conjoin'd with Ignorance, are thrown into the Balance, which make even the weightiest Arguments too light.

Moderatus.

Rehearser.

Moder. Master *Rehearser*, I find you have been very severe on Dr. Coward, in May and June last, in several of your Papers call'd *Rehearsers*? What? have you confuted him? or expos'd your self? or by your weak Reasonings made his Cause better?

Rehears. Good Mr. *Moderatus*, I am not sorry to see you but how come you to make it a Doubt, whether I have confuted Dr. Coward, or strengthened his Cause by my weak Reasoning? O! I have totally confuted him, turn'd him upside down. You may know that by his Silence.

Silence. If he could have answer'd me, he would; but I was for an Home-Stroke all at once.

Moder. That's very well, but I have known those *Home-Stroke Combatants* very often miss their Blows, and so have fell to the Ground, and been soundly beaten afterwards. And for his Silence, 'tis no Argument that you have confuted him, but it may be one that you have *prated to no purpose*; and that he Scorn'd to answer you, not seeing one Argument that deserv'd it.

Rehears. No? You shall Read 'em again, I'll Range 'em up again in Battalia, and let him or you answer so much as one of them. If you do, my Country-Man shall never turn Philosopher more.

Moder. Come, begin; You love Dialogue, and wrote in it; therefore I'll fight you at your own Weapons, and as you Charge me with Questions, so I hope, you'll give me leave to return the same sort of Shot again, when I shall think it convenient so to do.

Rehears. Ay, with all my Heart. *First*, therefore I Challenge with of my *Rehears. April 26.* where I make an Afs of *Afgil.* for his flight design'd for Heaven, and not going the Common way by Death thither.

Moder. Truly I think you make an Afs of your self, and if he will go up directly to Heaven, as he is; You have Built Castles in the Air enough to supply him, that he may have Refreshment at several Baiting-places, in so long a Journey.

Rehears. What mean you by that, Mr. *Moderatus*?

Moder. I think my meaning is plain. If you, and such as you would leave off Railing and Scurrility both out, and in the Pulpit, the World would not take Notice of those you call *Heterodox* Opinions. 'Tis such Public Rallery puts many Ignorant People upon Enquiry about Books and Opinions; which would otherwise dye neglected.

lected. And you to make the Authors of them Odious, Write, or Preach Notorious Lyes sometimes, to support your Calumnies, and Publick Base Reflections, telling the World such an Author justifies abominably Irreligious, or Atheistical Opinions, when in Reality he do's not.

Rehears. Who do's so? not I, the Observator may do so, but I don't.

Moder. Yes, you do, and many more. But I hope to see a Tax laid on all publick Papers, that if you Rail, you may pay for't: And an Act of Parliament to suppress the Insolence of the Pulpit.

Rehears. All in good time. And if you thank a Parliament for that; we'll thank them for another thing. They answer Books, otherwise sometimes unanswerable. And a good thing too, or else we should be pester'd with continual Scribble to no purpose.

Moder. What? As you have done the World Nine Weeks about Dr. Coward; and did as the Laborious Parson did, Preach Three times a Day and made nothing on't

Rehears. How? You shall see how I'll attack him. You see my Apology, N^o 222. July 2. for Tiring my Auditors upon one Subject so long, viz. In *Confuting our English Sadducees, who believe neither Angel, Spirit, nor the Resurrection, and 'tis to be fear'd, a God neither.* Is it not very handsome and fine? 'tis my Zeal and Concern for Religion, and our Souls, that makes me Trespass on my Auditors Patience.

Moder. A fine Apology indeed? Do you not Conform to the Government out of Zeal and Concern for Religion too? A special Gentleman! to be a Reformer of Religion who will not obey the Ordinances of God (as St. Paul, Rom. 13. calls the Powers of a Nation) out of

Zeal for Religion! But pray who are these *English* Sadducees? I never heard of any that *Deny the Resurrection*, Spirit, Angel, or God (tho' that can't be call'd Sadducism, I suppose) in this Age, but you may tell me all their Names: pray tell me them, if you can.

Rehears. Why *Asgil* do's, and the Quakers as I say, or I say false. If he don't, Dr Coward overthrows the Resurrection, for say I (*Rehears.* in *June*) 'tis the Soul distinguishes one Man from another; so the same Man, to make him the same, must have the same Soul at the Resurrection, else the same Man do's not Rise. But the Dr. Asserts the same Man to Rise again, because the same matter endow'd with Life again, will by the Power of God be Rais'd at the Resurrection.

Moder. Say you so? How do's the Dr. deny the Resurrection then?

Rehears. Why, he won't allow one Man to be distinguish'd from another, upon the Account of the Difference of Souls. *vid.* Farth. Thoughts. p. 84.



Moder. Nor any Body else of common Sense, I presume. Is a short little Crump-backed Man, distinguish'd from a Tall Slender Strait Man by his Soul? Do you know the Mark that distinguishes any Soul from another? The Observator's Country-Man would have call'd you *Blockhead* for urging such an Argument. Besides, you mistake the whole Question; you suppose every Man to have a *Spiritual Substance*, call'd Soul, which he shall have United to his Body, and therefore make the same Man again at the Resurrection. Now what you suppose true, is false; Man has not, by any Authority of Scripture, any such *Spiritual Substance*, therefore you prove nothing, if you first don't prove your *Supposition*.

Rehear.

Rehears. No? But if a Man han't the *same Soul*; tho' he won't allow it to be a *Spiritual Substance*, he don't Rise the *same Man*.

Moder. By your Reasoning he can't indeed, so who overthrows the Resurrection now? For the *Immortal Soul* can't Rise again (because it was never Dead) how then can the Principal part, which (as you say) makes *Man* to be the *same*, not being Rais'd, Denominate *Man* to be Rais'd the *same Man* at the Resurrection?

Rehears. Hold! I must take care of that, not to overthrow the Resurrection. Therefore say I, that the Resurrection is not overthrown, if the *Body* only be Rais'd, and *not the whole Man*; that's a sufficient Salvo for me, and my *same Man*.

Moder. That won't do. For the *Body* is not the *Man*, or *Person* of the *Man*, but the whole *Compositum* makes the *Man*; and wou'd you consult your *Greek*, or *Latin* Testaments on *Luke* 20. 37. and parallel Places in the other Evangelists, you would find *reserxi Mortui*, the *Men*, not *Cadavera*, are Rais'd from the Dead. But this is prov'd so Demonstratively plain by the Dr. already, that I must needs say, you deal very Basely by him, to Charge him with the *Denyal* of the *Resurrection*, when your own Incoherent Deductions proves your own Arguments false, and Idle. *vid. Second Thoughts*, Cap. ult.

Rehears. But Dr. Coward holds God to be Matter. *Rehears.* No. 210. May 21. 1707. Because he says, the Word *SPIRIT* denotes those beings which are usually Term'd *Immaterial*, as God, Angels, nay Spectrums and Apparitions. Now his saying, God is *USUALLY* call'd *Immaterial*, inferrs, that he believes it not, but reckons it a *Vulgar Error*.

Error. All which he Ridicules, and believes not a Word of 'em.

Moder. A Bold Stroke indeed, a barefac'd Falsity is call'd a *Notorious Lye*. I doubt you have chang'd your *Soul*, and have not the *Soul of Man*, much less a *Christian*. The Place where the Judges keep their Courts of Justice is *usually* call'd *Westminster-Hall*: is that Sense, or not?

Rehears. Yes, 'tis Sense; but it implies you don't believe there is such a Place as *Westminster-Hall*; if you had said *Commonly*, you had said right; but I don't like the Word *usually*, it implies, *doubt*, and *disbelief*.

Moder. Now, you talk like your self. There is a Part in a Goose, *usually* call'd the *Soul of a Goose*, take heed of a Transmigration.

Rehears. There I have you again. The Doctor's Argument from Transmigration, Comparative to Annihilation, is very absurd and weak, as I prove (*Rehears.* 209. May 17.) There I have a fine Stroke at him. He says, *if God Annihilates your Substantial Spirit, it is still in his Power to re-create it, and in his Disposal to reimplant it in the Body, or no.*

Moder. What hurt is there in all this? Can't God do what he will?

Rehears. Hold, hold, — If a thing be reduc'd to nothing, which is call'd *Annihilation*, how can it be re-created? A thing cannot be Created but once. There may be a *New-Creation*, but not of the same thing, for when it is once *Annihilated* it is nothing. So that God may Create a New Soul, but that cannot be said to be any Soul that was *Annihilated*.

Moder. Hey dey; Here's a great deal to do about *Nothing*. This whole Cavil is falsely charg'd on the Doctor

Doctor, for want of Ability to understand his Reasoning. For Pag. 34. *Furth. Thoughts*; He argues against his Adversary about the *Souls returning to God*, Eccles. 12. 7. Who asserts it a sufficient Explication of that Text, to answer,— *That it is not meant that wicked Souls return into his Hands, or Presence*; but it is sufficient, *if they return into his Power, or Disposal*. This is the Answer of his Opponent, not the Doctor's, for in that very Paragraph, he pleads all you here palm on him, against such a trivial Exposition.

Rehears. Is it so? then in troth I am mistaken; I thought it had been otherwise. But if a *Soul* should pass out of a Man into a Beast, that Beast would be a Man, wouldn't he? *vid. Rehears. No. 209.*

Moderat. No, no more than you would be an Ass, if you spoke rationally as *Balaam's Ass* did. The Soul makes not the Man, nor the Body the Man, but both together conjoyn'd. You have a strange way of Philosophizing; you can only know him to be a Man by his reasoning, and distinguish'd from another Man by his outward Form, Voice, Quality, and Qualifications. Then say you, *He supposes the Soul to sleep till the Resurrection*, which is a downright Falsity. For he supposes no such thing. Nay, all that whole *Rehearsal* is totally false, and sufficiently confuted in the Doctor's own Books already.

Rehears. But it is a common Opinion of the Deists, That the Soul of Man dies with the Body, and that there is no future Account, Rewards or Punishments, and therefore they take great Delight in this Book of Dr. Coward, who says the Soul dyes with the Body, and what he says of the Resurrection, gives them no Disturbance, *Rehears.*
May 28.

Moderat.

Moderat. Hold a little, let's return to the Blunder, as you call it---- *Of God's Re-creating a thing out of nothing.* Did you ever read of God's creating the World out of *Nothing*? If you han't; you have but little Skill in Scriptural Texts, or Learning, and therefore your Argument is *nothing* in it self. Therefore if God created the World out of nothing, which is *making a Something out of Nothing*, what Absurdity is it to say, God may reduce it to its Primitive Nothing, and Recreate the same World again? I doubt you question the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, when you talk thus, if God can't create the same thing a Thousand times, if he pleases, out of nothing. For the very Definition of Creation, is *the Production of a Thing out of Nothing*. Again, you are very nice to tell us, that *there may be a new Creation, but the same thing can be created but once.*---- Why not? since the Production is out of nothing. Can't the same thing be produced out of nothing but once?

Rehearsal. I don't deny God's Power in any thing that doth not imply a Contradiction, But the Doctor owns the Resurrection the better to undermine all Religion, lest he should attack it too bare-fac'd, or acts to that purpose, vid. *Rehearsl. May.*

Moderat. What a strange Construction is this? Inhumane and Unchristian. When in at least Five Hundred Places of his Writings, he so solemnly contend for, supports, and espouses the Doctrine of the Resurrection, future Rewards, and Punishments; but if there are such People in the World, as make ill Constructions and Use of his Argumentation, as you do, and many more do of the very Scriptures too, 'tis their own Faults. For I dare justifie, that in the main he offers nothing dissonant to Reason, Religion, or Morality.

So pray don't say things of a Gentleman, which can be prov'd downright Lyes. Pardon my Stile, and Language, in so plain a Provocation. For I have wip'd my A --- lately with your *Rehearsal*, and it has affected my Head, as some get a Singing in their Heads by wiping their A --- with Ballads.

Rehearsal. I hope you are not angry. He is represented by *Common Fame*, a Man that broaches horrid impious Doctrines, and particularly denies the *Immortality of the Soul*, &c. I think I use him civilly enough, I style him, *The Learned Dr. Coward* in my *Rehearsals*, for no body can call him B-----d.

Moderat. Civilly do you call it? when you tax him, as a Subverter of the principal Fundamentals of Christianity, &c. As for *Common Fame*, she is always a *Common Lyar*. I'll give you the Epitome presently of his whole Doctrines, or Opinion, and confute them fairly, and I will assure you of a Living near 300 l. per An. upon your taking the Oaths to the Government withal.

Rehearsal. That's a good Offer indeed; but I told you in my *Rehearsal* of July 28. *That I had done with the Doctor*, and I'll not begin again: Only I desire you to kick and cuff a Text or two about, and then give me his Doctrine epitomiz'd, as you say, Come have at you; Mat. x. v. 28. *Fear not them that can kill the Body, but are not able to kill the Soul*, &c. This I say, the Doctor makes a Figurative Expression, and that Figure makes it a Contradiction.

Moderat. Pray what Figure does he make it? Prov. 26. v. 4. Answer not a Fool, and v. 5. Answer a Fool, according to his Folly, have just such a Figure. He tells you, that by *killing the Soul*, there express'd, is meant *taking away the present Life*, explain'd sufficiently,

v. 39. by losing this Life in order to find Life everlasting. *He that loseth his Life for my sake shall find it*, says our Saviour. Don't all the whole Chapter run upon *Life being lost*, by Persecution for the Gospel's sake? I see no Figure in it, but it seems by the *English* Translation to be made difficult, whereas, had you argued from the *Latine* or *Greek* Words, *ψυχή*, *Anima* you could have made no Argument of it, but you must have given me a reason why those words ought not to have been rendred *Life of the Body*, as they are in all that very Chapter. And *taking away the Life of the Body* is neither Non-sense, nor Derogates from the Truth of the Text.

Rehears. O! But he parallels it with, *This is my Body*, which I say means, *This represents my Body*, and can't be understood literally.

Moderat. Literally; you are in the right certainly, neither can the other be meant, v. 39. *Losing to find Life*, literally also, but wants Exposition, and the Explanation of its Signification. But this Text is so plain, easie and intelligible in the Book it self, that I'll refer my unsatisfy'd Reader thither. However, Suppose a *Soul that can't be killed*, What do you here call *Soul*?

Rehears. You must give me time to answer that, you are too quick upon me. In the mean time come to *Eccles. 3. 18, 19.* Concerning the Spirit of Man that goes upward, and the Spirit of Beasts that goes downward. I say, that is only meant that the Spirits of Men go up to God in Thoughts and Meditations, which the Souls of Beasts do not. For our Business is not what becomes of the Souls of Beasts, that is a Curiosity, and I wash my Hands of it, May 21. *Rehears.*

Moderat. Now I find you will not be bound by the Scriptures, as you said of the Doctor. Indeed that looks

as if you understood not common Sense ; for the whole Contexts relate to Man and Beasts dying, and whither they go after Death, as you may read it, *Eccles. 3. 19, 20.* And you talk of a Man's *ascending in Meditation*, and a Beast's *descending in Meditation*.

Rehears. No I don't say a Word about the *Souls of Beasts*, but say, 'tis a *Curiosity*, and I *wash my Hands of it*.

Moderat. Do so, as *Pilate* did, and make only this Confession upon it, That you are *guiltless of that Virtue called TRUTH*. Let the Doctor look to that, and perhaps you may gain a sober Character again. For *Repentance of Lying, and scandalous Defamation, is next kin to entire Innocence*.

Now I'll give the Reader an Epitome, taken out of *Dr. Coward's Works*, of his Doctrine or Principles concerning the Nature of a *Soul*, and at the same time challenge the whole World to prove them *Irreligious, Atheistical, or Immoral*, notwithstanding the Railings from the Pulpit, or a trifling News-Paper.

His First Position is, That God made Man out of the Dust of the Earth, and breathed into his Nostrils *Breath of Life*, (not endow'd him with a *Spiritual, or Immaterial Substance*, call'd *Soul*) by which Man became a living Creature. This he proves by the Word of God, spoke by *Moses*, *Gen. 2. v. 7.* So let God be true, and every Man a Lyar. Now, Reverend Author of a *Publick News-Paper*, tell me what you say to this?

Rehears. Why, ay, 'tis true, I don't find fault with this Text, but sure Man must have a *Soul*, besides *Breath of Life*, that survives his dead Body, else our Education has led us into a palpable Error.

Moderat. Why must Man have a *Soul*, besides *Breath of Life*? Is not this thought a plain Text? Do you believe the Scripture, or no? Can any Man have *more Soul* than *Adam*? And have not Beasts *Breath of Life*, as Man had at first? 'Tis plain they have, as is prov'd by *Genesis*, Chap. 6. v. 17. and ch. 7. v. 15, 22. So that whoever cannot confute this Text, must yield Man to be made of *Body and Life*, that is, *not Body and Soul*, meaning thereby a *Spirit that can exist separately* from the Body.

Rehears. How then came we by that Notion of *Soul*?

Moderat. Philosophers impos'd upon the World in Primitive Times, and poyson'd their Education with Notions and Whims, never justifiable by the Holy Scriptures. For you must know, that the Heathen Philosophers form'd a Notion of such a *Spiritual Substance*, united to the Body, and in all their Writings call'd it *Ψυχή* in Greek, and *Anima* in Latin, and our Translations of the Bible have in many Places render'd it the *Soul*, after the Language of those Heathen Philosophers, by which Men have been deluded into a Belief, that the Scripture meant *Soul* in the same Sense, as the Heathen Philosophers did; when as really it ought not to be so interpreted, but every where relating to Man's Composition, to be rendred *Life*, and not *Soul*.

Rehears. What, you think then that People are led into an erroneous Opinion, by following the Steps of the Heathen Philosophers?

Moderat. I do so indeed; and its evidently plain enough from the Scheme of the Popish Religion, that Heathen Philosophy is the Ground of many of their principal Fundamentals, as is proved Chap. 9. Of *second*

cond Thoughts. And why should it be thought that the Protestant, as well as Papist, should not err, by misapprehending the meaning of many Places in Scripture? I hope we are not infallible, though more reform'd from Errors than they are.

Rehears. They may err indeed, and it's plain by the Number of Sects some *must* err, for none are totally infallible, I confess; but yet I cannot tell how to brook your Text, it presses close, the Translators would have done well to have render'd all Places *Life* then, which are now render'd *Soul*; for we must carry in our Heads the Idea of such a *Soul*, as Heathens devis'd. But why did they devise such a *Soul*?

Moderat. Because they saw *wicked Men thrive* in the World, and *good Men often afflicted*, as David says, *Pf. 73*. Therefore to encourage the *good Men* to persevere in Goodness, notwithstanding they were afflicted, the Philosophers taught their Disciples, that they had *Spiritual Substances united to their Bodies*, call'd *Souls*, which should be punish'd or rewarded according to their Merits immediately after Death, by them call'd a Separation of *Soul and Body*, which is nought but a Separation of *Life and Body*.

Rehears. And how came we by that Philosophic Notion? Or they to teach it?

Moderat. They taught it to be a *Substance, &c.* by reason they wanted the Light of the Scriptures, and we learn'd it from them by Education. The Scriptures teach us no such Doctrine, though it distinguishes *Life and Body*, as much as *Soul and Body*, are conceived to be two *different Things*, though not *different Substances*, *Mat. 6. 25*.

Rehears. But why does he deny the *Immortality of the Soul*?

Moderat. Where do you prove it by Scripture, that Man is endow'd with an *Immortal Soul*? You see he was never so created; and you know *Plato*, an Heathen, was one of the first that preach'd up the Doctrine of the *Immortality of the Soul*. Keep to the Scripture, don't tell me of Philosophy. Man, after the Resurrection will be Immortal, but cannot *be in his Soul* as soon as he dies, and I think that is no denying Immortality to Man.

Rehears. How do you prove this?

Moderat. By Scripture and Reason. For if the Souls of wicked Men went to Hell, and those of the Righteous to Heaven, as soon as they dy'd, what need is there of a General Judgment of all Mankind at the last Day. If they are in Heaven, they have the greatest Reward, they can have; if in Hell, the greatest Punishment. So, why should they be examin'd and call'd to Account when they enjoy the utmost Happiness, or Misery, they can already?

Rehears. This seems to be a strong Argument; but I don't doubt but it has been answer'd already, so I won't meddle with it.

Moderat. Never was yet answer'd, nor ever can be, that I am positive; so why such Raillery, and Clamour should be made against him, for denying the Immortality of a Being call'd the *Substantial Soul* of Man, when he does not deny but that *Man* will be *Immortal* after the Resurrection, I cannot see. The Scripture is of his side, why then d'ont you blame the Scriptures?

Rehears. What Scripture-Proofs d'ye bring?

Moderat. I could quote you forty places in the New Testament, where by the word *Then*, (meaning at the Day of the Resurrection, and not before) the Wicked shall be punished, and the Righteous rewarded, but
more

more particularly, *Mat. 13.* in the Parable of the Tares, explain'd by our Saviour himself, worth your reading considerately. Besides, the *Fallen Angels were not punish'd with immediate Torments, but are reserv'd in everlasting Chains under Darknesh, unto the Judgment of the Great Day, Jude 6. 2 Pet. 2. 4.* Now if we suffer in our Souls immediately as soon as we dye, don't we contradict the Scriptures, and impose a thing on Mankind to believe, which ought not to be believ'd?

Rehears. I can't tell whether I do or not; I won't answer you; only I'll say this, that then both Body and Soul united will be punish'd together. But the Soul will be punish'd by it self, in Hell, or somewhere else, till the Resurrection.

Moderat. How can you urge such a simple ridiculous Answer to the positive Words of Scripture, which plainly assert, That Punishment of the Wicked, though Angels made Devils, shall not begin till the Day of Judgment? I am asham'd to see Men of any tolerable Parts so greedy of deluding themselves, and subverting plain Texts of Scripture.

Rehears. Pretty plain indeed, but let me interpret them my way, you shall find them not so plain on your side, as you make them.

Moderat. This I find by your last *Rehearser*, you can wrest a Text pretty well to a wrong meaning. But what say you to this Position; GOD is a JUST GOD, is he not?

Rehears. Yes he is, I cannot deny it, what then?

Moderat. Why! A just God will never condemn a Sinner to Punishment without Examination of his Crime. Now, God having appointed but one Day of Judgment, call'd the *Great Day of Judgment*, to judge a Sinner, and examine him in, you will make him break his Word
and

and Promise; nay, be *unjust*, if he condemn a Sinner to Hell, without the said Examination, as it necessarily follows he must do, if a Sinner goes immediately [in his Soul] to Hell, as soon as he dyes, before he has received Sentence at the Day of Judgment.

Rehears. Not so close upon me, I beseech you; What, does the *Soul sleep in the Grave then* till the Resurrection?

Moderat. No, the *Soul* sleeps not, *Life* cannot sleep; *It returns to God that gave it*, and the *Body* moulders to Dirt, *Eccles. xii. 7.* Returns not as a *Spiritual Substance*, but as a *Power*, derived from God at first, and at the Death of every Person resum'd, as *Psal. 104. v. 29.* *David* expresses it, and in *Gen. 2. 7.* It is call'd *Breath of Life*. By which is not meant, the *Common Air or Breath* we breath, but an *Active Principle* in us, call'd *LIFE*, which by the *Supernatural Power* of God enlivens our *Bodies*, and makes us capable of doing all those things we do in the World.

Rehears. Does *Life* make my *Body* capable of *Thinking* and *Sense*? No, *Matter, quâ Matter*, cannot Think, or Reason, 'tis certain.

Moderat. Where God has given *Life*, he has given likewise the *Power of Reasoning*, though in some living *Creatures* in a more perfect Degree than in others, as in *Men* is plain, and in some *Men* more perfectly than in others; and in *Beasts* according to their Condition. And when I hear the question put, *can Matter, quâ Matter, think?* I smile at the Impertinence thereof. For it is as much as to say---- Can a *Thing that is incapable in it self of thinking*, think? How ridiculous is such a question? Put it right, *Can God make Matter capable of thinking?* I say yes he can, and has done it in *Men* and *Beasts*, and he cannot be a *Christian* that denies it. Do you deny it?

Rehears.

Rehears. No, I dare not, but methinks 'tis a long time to sleep in the Grave till the Resurrection. I hope to go to Heaven, as soon as I am Dead.

Moder. You must Ground your hopes on the Scriptures, if you do, and become one of God Almighty's *Favourites* then (as *Moses* was, *Deut.* 36. v. 6. who Dyed and was Buried, yet was in Heaven before a General Resurrection, because he was seen by our Saviour and his Disciples, *Mat.* 17. 3.) You may go to Heaven *immediately* after Dead. Because the Gift of Heaven is a Free-Gift, and God can give it as soon as he pleases to an *Abraham*, *Isaac*, a *Jacob*, &c. or such whom he vouchsafes to call his *Friends*. But I doubt you have some account to give, and must stay till the Resurrection.

Rehears. Well? that will be a long while, if I do, I have a good Respite, so I shall dye with the less Terror of Punishment on me,

Moder. Here you are under a great mistake. The next Moment to the Dead is the Day of Judgment, tho' they lye in the Grave 100000 Years. The Dead measure no Time; a Log, or Stone, may as well measure time, as a Dead Man. Therefore don't flatter your self in a long Respite. I wish you don't think 100000 Years too short a time for a Respite, as you call it, when you are to appear on the Great Day.

Rehears. I hope I shall be able to stand in that Great Day, before God and his Angels, tho' not as an Innocent, but as a Penitent: Well! lets go on. Why do you call the *Soul* a *Power* only? That seems to me to be a *meer Nothing*; I would have it a *Substance* because it is something *that can't be Kill'd*, *Math.* x. 28.

Moder. How came you to call *Powers* nothing? they are the only Springs of Activity in all things in the World:

World; because it is no *Substance*, you presently call it *Nothing*, which is a Grand Error: for it is really every thing in Effect. Inspiration, which is a Power Divine, made the Apostles Work Miracles, and the same Divine Influence endow'd *Sampson* with that Prodigious strength beyond any before, or since him. And according to second Causes are not Germination, Swift-ness, or Motion, Gravity, Levity, and Elasticity and the like, *Powers* without which 'tis impossible many things can come to pass. They are not *meer Nothings* because join'd to Matter, but are call'd in Philosophy *Accidents*, or *Qualities* which are not *meer Nothings*, as you call 'em.

Rehears. They are next to *Nothing*. As soon as a Bowl has done running, the *Motion* is invisible and lost, so is Heat lost, when the Fire out.

Moder. Take heed now, I doubt you'll Burn your Fingers with a *meer Nothing* By and by. This will run us into Philosophical Disputes, which I'll not do. But I aver that there are things in the World call'd *Powers*, or *Qualities*, distinct from Matter, and 'tis plain to Sense and Reason, that Motion is not Matter. Therefore if I state *Life* to be a *Power*, and define it as Dr. Coward has ingeniously done it, I shall not do amiss, *viz. Life is a Power Originally infused by God into insensible matter, by which that matter Lives, and Exerts Sense and Reason.*

Rehears. This a fine Spun Notion of *Life*, and Philosophical enough, but I'll enter the Lists no more. Let every Reader Judge of his Opinion whether consonant to Reason and Scripture. All that sticks in my Stomach is that Text (as I told you, *Mat. x. 28.*) Of Killing the Soul.

Moder. I see no reason you have to adhere so close

to your own Interpretation. Bring it but to the Touch-Stone Text, upon which all other Interpretations of Texts must depend, and tell me, if it be possible to make *Soul* in *Mat. x. 28.* different from *Breath of Life* in *Gen. 2. 7.* then I yield. But if we have not the Sacred Word Right Translated, nor any Grounds to believe we have any other *Soul*, than *Life*, (as we have not) which will be lost at Death, and be renewed in our Bodies at the Resurrection, then all the Noise, Clamour, and Calumny against the Dr. for Ill Principles, and Opinions, is false, scandalous and unworthy. Thus has the Reader the Epitome of the most Material Points that can be said relating to the Modern Controversie of the *Soul*. And now I only put it to his Conscience to determine, as he will one Day answer it at the Great Tribunal, whether any of those Principles support Immorality, or be Destructive to Religion. So Farewel, and Remember *That as the Tongue is a Fire, a World of Iniquity; so it is amongst Our Members that which defileth the whole Body, and setteth on Fire the Course of Nature, until it is set on Fire of Hell, James 6. 3.*

POSTSCRIPT.

THUS have I given you an Abstract of that Opinion, so Industriouslly Rail'd at by you and others, for no reason that I know, unless because it's a *Truth not to be confuted*. You see plainly there is nothing in it that Derogates from the Christian Religion.

D

The

The Doctrine of the *Resurrection* and *General Judgment* so vigorously asserted, (which to the *Dead* is the *very next minute* after the *Breath* is out of their *Body*) *Future Rewards and Punishments* so frequently proved by it, to be due to the *Righteous* and *Wicked*, must sure put it out of all *Doubt*, or *Question*, whether it be a *Doctrine* conform to *Christianity*, or no. But I am apt to Guess the Reason of *such Mens* Anger, and *Calumny* against it, which is, because it wholly takes away some *main Fundamentals* of the *Popish Religion*, viz. *Prayers for the Dead*, *Invocation of Saints*, and *Purgatory*. *Advantagious Articles* for the *Church of Rome*, and for *that Reason* perhaps with *some Men* too Grating a *Reflection*. Now if this be the *Ground* of your *Railing*, tell the *World* so. Strip your self of your *Sheeps Cloathing*, and by your *Natural Howling* discover what you are. The *Summary* of the *Christian Religion*, I look upon to be contain'd in the *Lords Prayer*, *Ten Commandments*, and the *Apostles Creed*. Pray in which of them is the *Immortality* of the *Soul* asserted? *Life Everlasting* is in the *Creed*, propos'd as an *Article of Faith*, but it is to *Man*, not to a *Soul* in its own *Nature Immortal*. Therefore if in neither of them, as it's apparent it is not, what *unchristian Doctrine* is it to deny the *Immortality* of the *Separate Soul*, when our *Religion* does not *Command* us to *Believe*, or *Teach* any such *Doctrine*? 'Tis true it *Teaches* us that *That Man will be Immortal*, but not till after the *Resurrection*. 1. *Cor.* 15. But this *Doctrine* was not taught us till *Christ brought Life and Immortality through the Gospel*. It was He first reveal'd that *Myfterious Truth* to us, and let us know that even our *Mortal Bodies* should put on *Immortality* tho' *Moulder'd to Dirt*, and by so many *Changes*

in process of Time and converted into other Bodies, or Substances; that they seem'd to be totally lost, should yet revive; and we become the same *living Creatures* as before. Had not Christ revealed this Resurrection of the Body, that wise Philosopher must have thought it impossible, who first taught us that Erroneous Doctrine of a *Spiritual Substance united to our Bodies*, which Opinion, I heartily wish all *Protestants* would reject, which would mightily add Lustre to our *Reformation*, and become a wonderful Stroke for subverting *Popery*. I hope, God will give a Blessing and Success in future Ages, if not in this, to the better extirpating this Philosophic Heathenish Notion of a *Substantial Soul*; when by some other Hand, of Greater Character in the World, it shall be exploded, and confuted, as it deserves. For if *Man* has no other *Soul* than *Breath of Life*, (as it appears by the Holy Scriptures He has not) why don't we act conform to the Scriptures? What! are we ashamed to discard an old Notion, because lately found Erroneous, and not Consonant to the *Word of God*? If so, remember the Denuntiation. — *He that is ashamed of me, and my Words, in this adulterous Generation; of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh in the Glory of his Father, with the holy Angels, Mark viii. 38.* Come let us lay our Hands upon our Hearts, and weigh the Truth of an Opinion, not the *Antiquity*, or the force of it from *Tradition*, or Author of it. Why do we halt between two Opinions? If *Breath of Life* be *Immaterial* or *Spiritual Substance*, let us make it an Article of the Church, if not of Faith? If it is impossible to be *Substance*, let us reject it, and examine what ought to be call'd *SOUL*, and wherein its Nature consists. I confess, it is too degenerate and ingrateful an Age to expect a Reward for the Discovery of so important a Truth.

But

But were it in my Power, and the Discoverer would qualify himself for it, I should think one of the best Preferments in the Church too little a Reward for so signal a Service done to God and Religion, in detecting this *Philosophic Imposture*. This I say, that we be no more Children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every Wind of (Heathen Philosophic) Doctrine, by the slight of Men, and cunning Craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive. Ephes. iv. 14. For we have not so learned Christ.

Lastly, As for those who say, that the Dr. asserts the Materiality, and Mortality of the Soul: They do him wrong; he asserts neither in his Works, according to his Notion of the Soul; for that would be asserting the Materiality and Mortality of the Life, which is Nonsense, if not a Contradiction. And that the next Minute is the Day of Resurrection, every Man proves by himself in Relation to Time past, as well as Future. What does a Child, just capable of Remembring, remember of the first Thousand Years, and upwards, since the World began. Is not that Time past to him, nay, to us also of ripe years, less than a Minute? Certain it must be, and therefore conclude with me, and believe the Scriptures, not false Teachers or Preachers, that Man dieth and wasteth away, yea, Man giveth up the Ghost, and where is He? As the Waters fail from the Sea, and the Flood decayeth, and drieth up; So Man lieth down, and riseth not till the Heavens be no more. They shall not awake, or be raised out of their Sleep. Job xiv. V. 19 11.

F I N I



